

be placed to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates for 1907, a sum not exceeding £10,000 towards defraying the expense of survey and formation of a first-class road between Armadale and the golf links.

Mr. DE NALLIS seconded the motion, which was put and passed.

ELECTORAL ROLLS COLLECTION BILL.

Mr. FAIRKES obtained leave to introduce a bill to authorise the employment of the police in collecting the Electoral roll.

VOLUNTEERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. PARKES moved that the House will, on Wednesday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the expediency of introducing a bill to regulate the Volunteer Force.

The question was put and passed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. LANG begged leave to address the House on a question of privilege. It had come to his knowledge, as soon as the Presbyterian College Bill was sent to the other House, that certain had been introduced into the House of

[illegible]

the Freyherster College. He said that no such bill was required, but as he stood alone his opinion was overruled, and a separation was appointed for the 10th inst. to ascertain whether they would consent to the introduction of such a bill, and whether they would support it. The Premier then stated that such a bill was necessary, and that the Senate of that University had passed a resolution which would do away with any disability that might exist. In the meantime as no action could be taken until the Assembly met in October, the Premier then announced that he stated in the House at the earlier part of the session, that it was probable the House would be prorogued in November. He saw that unless some speedy amicable steps were taken, there would be a possibility of carrying a College Bill through the House during the present year, to the disappointment of all concerned. Under the circumstances he had obtained leave to introduce the bill that had passed its second reading in 1864, subject of course to any amendments that might be made in the course through both Houses. Unwilling, however, to steal a march on the College, he had written the following letter to the Rev. William Parson, of Maidstone, now moderator of the General Assembly—

Oxford, 11th August, 1866.

Dear and dear Sir,—As the preliminary difficulty in the way of the College Committee has now been virtually got over, it has occurred to me (which I beg to apologise for saying) that there is a way by which the Freyherster College Association might readily be settled to the satisfaction of all concerned. As I have observed at the committee, if I remember right, that the hall at its meeting in October, there would be no possibility of getting that bill through the House before the prorogation, which Mr. Martin has stated may take place in November, notice and preliminary steps requiring at least six weeks, or thereby.

But if a bill, approved by the Assembly, although totally different from mine, should be substituted for mine, by way of amendment, which I do not desire, and if the members of the parties concerned, the bill, *compromised as it would in all likelihood be*, of both kinds, could be got through all the stages during the present session of Parliament.

Therefore, as convener of the College Committee, you would draw a bill or a resolution, and then you would have a meeting, to be afterwards, when approved by that committee, submitted to the General Assembly, and approval of the General Assembly. I am quite well acquainted with the preliminary proceedings in the case of my bill or your bill, and I am quite as familiar with the proceedings in the case of my bill or your bill as you are, and I am quite as familiar with the proceedings in the case of my bill or your bill as you are, and I am quite as familiar with the proceedings in the case of my bill or your bill as you are.

My object from the first has been to get the question definitely disposed of this session, and the way I have now suggested is the way that I think can be done.

I am good then as to let me know whether you will take this course, that I may act accordingly.

Very, very, and dear Sir, yours most sincerely,
H. W. Purves.

Mr. Purves cordially approved of his suggestion, and at the next meeting of the committee he presented a bill in the name of a bill somewhat different to his, which bill was adopted. This draft bill received further amendment in the General Assembly. It was then presented to the General Assembly at the first time, and the following committee appointed to take into consideration, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hay, Dr. Wilson, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Cairns, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Robert Stewart, Mr. John Stewart, and Dr. Lang. With the exception of Mr. Cooper, all the members of this committee were members of the General Assembly. The committee took an interest in the matter, and so that nothing was done to the prejudice of any party concerned. As he had stated in his letter, the bill was not introduced into the General Assembly's bill into Parliament was as a series of amendments on his own, so both bills were before the select committee. The bill was then introduced into the Upper House; that he was bound to have aban-

married the General Assembly's draft instead of his own, but
 such a course was out of the question, for a bill
 could not be introduced into this House except
 after petition from the people. All the necessary
 steps prior to the introduction had been taken in connection with his bill, so he had
 paid £25 for that bill before the session of 1893-4
 in hopes that the second payment of the same amount
 would be waived. But when the bill was introduced,
 paying £25 a second time, the bill passed its first reading,
 and the select committee of the Legislative Assembly took
 into consideration the Grand Chamberlain's bill
 with the two in the hands of the members, and his own
 impression was that the result of this reference produced a
 change for better.

original bill) or the one from the General Assembly. It had been stated that he had not taken the proper title for the bill, for the General Assembly had recommended that the college should be called St. Andrew's College. But a motion to that effect had been passed by a majority of only one at the last meeting, when most of the country members had gone home. The Assembly had proposed to that designation. But there were other and stronger reasons against it. There had been eighteen petitions for the College Bill, and in the face of the opposition of the petitioners they would not have been granted that designation. Besides, the name of St. Andrew had already been appropriated by the Church of England as the name of its cathedral, and if the Presbyterian took the same St. Andrew, it would be a disgrace to Sydney, he would not know how to dispose of himself—whether as an Episcopalian under the Bishop, or as a Presbyterian under the people of Scotland, or a part of Ireland. There was a small number upon whom strong feelings were cherished, and the committee did not feel warranted by sanctioning the change. There was another point of difference between the petitioners and the General Assembly. A vote was passed by the General Assembly, by the same narrow majority of

rise, to the effect that all the patronage of the
the future could be secured by the Government.
General Assembly. The committee set their face
against any such recommendation as that. Mr. Crow
stated that much was suggested by the fact that
the Government had no right to make a selection,
diction, and other members stated that no layman, having
any self-respect, would accept office under such conditions.
There might be some minor amendments introduced
into the Legislative Council, but that was not the
question. The committee then proceeded to the
proceedings of a number of this House had been
so misrepresented in influential quarters in the Upper
House, to set himself at liberty with the House.
He had acted fairly and honourably throughout this matter.
He did not care so much for any censure in reference to
the matter as he did for the truth.

such things were stated and believed concerning the procedure of those who had it in hand. The members of the select committee, including Mr. Cowper, took great pains in bringing the bill into the shape in which it was introduced to the other House, after having been passed without change or amendment in the Legislative Assembly. He concluded by moving *pro forma* the adjournment of the House.

The motion was negatived.

POLITICAL PENSIONS.

Mr. BUCHANAN moved, "That, the opinion of this House, the granting of pensions to the select committee, to Edward Deschamps, F. & S. Merewether, J. H. Plunkett, and W. M. Manning is wrong so far as it is inquisitive that the House should be adopted to extinguish it. That Mr. Johnston receives a pension of £2000 a year, and has in this way, already drawn £25,000 out of the people's money. That Mr. Merewether receives in the same way £1000 a year, and has already drawn £9,000 of the people's money. That Mr. Johnston

\$12,200 of the people's money. That Mr. Manning received \$500 a year, and has already drawn \$5880 of the people's money. That the total amount of those drawn amounts to \$12,200. That the money was drawn on the business paper, and so convinced was he of the inquiry and unjustifiable character of the money that he related, so impressed was he with the baseness of this barefaced robbery committed under such deplorable circumstances that the House might expect to have a great deal of it yet. The House treatment was not fair. On the one hand, members of the House voted for these pensions on the consideration that they were getting extended rights to the waste lands of the Government. On the other, these pensioners voted for the sale of the pension themselves. So inequitable was the whole proceeding, that he should not cease to bring it under the attention of the House as necessary, by making it an article of motion. He would not persist in various grounds. These pensioners were not servants of the colonies, but of the Imperial Government, by whom the pensions, if any were deserved, should have been paid.

ny au/pla news-page1469617

